

## REMARKS

In the office action, the Examiner rejected each of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,890,014 issued to Long. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are requested.

The present invention relates to an improved method for measuring system performance in a mass storage system, which has a plurality of disk drive storage elements controlled by a disk drive controller. The disk drive controller receives commands and data from and returns at least data to a plurality of host computers. The method features (1) enabling a graphical user interface for generating an input parameter containing sequence input of commands for operating the system for measuring system performance, (2) generating from the input parameter sequence a test sequence input identifying commands to be sent to the storage system, (3) executing at at least one host computer a test request identified by the test sequence input, by sending commands to the mass storage system, (4) accumulating at at least the executing host computer, data regarding performance of the mass storage system, in response to the requests sent by the host computer, and (5) processing the accumulated data in response to at least to the one host-generated command.

Long discloses a method for improving data transfer performance between a single host computer and a peripheral data storage device. The reference is not directed to measuring system performance. Long discloses a device driver residing in the host computer's local memory that dynamically tunes the performance of the data storage device. The device driver includes an I/O profiler subroutine which profiles incoming I/O requests made by the host computer to the device driver. The I/O profiler examines each incoming I/O request and identifies patterns in the stream of I/O requests. Identified I/O request patterns are identified to the device driver, which determines if the internal performance parameter settings of the data storage device are optimally configured to respond to the requested I/O pattern. Depending on the

outcome of the determination, new internal performance parameter settings are commanded by the device driver to the data storage device to improve the data storage device's data transfer rate performance and overall data throughput. (col. 3, lines 13-39).

As mentioned above, Long is not directed to measuring system performance in a mass storage system as specified in independent Claim 1. Further, Long also does not relate to measuring system performance in a system that has a plurality of disk drive storage elements controlled by a disk drive controller, which receives commands and data from and returns at least data to a plurality of host computers. Long does not disclose or suggest the possibility of a disk drive controller that receives commands and data from and returns at least data to a plurality of host computers because it only transfers data between a single host computer and a peripheral data storage device.

Furthermore, Long does not disclose or suggest generating an input parameter containing sequence input of commands for operating the system for measuring system performance since Long does not measure system performance.

In addition, Long does not disclose or suggest accumulating at at least the executing host computer, data regarding performance of the mass storage system, in response to the requests sent by the host computer. As discussed above, Long only discloses monitoring incoming I/O requests at a single host computer and tuning the performance of the data storage device. Long describes interrogating the data storage device to determine if the storage device is already programmed with a preferred set of mode parameter page values corresponding to a current I/O request pattern (col. 15, lines 40-57). This data is not data regarding performance of the mass storage system received in response to the specified requests sent by the host computer as specified in Claim 1.


Claim 1 is therefore patentable over Long. The rejection of Claim 1 and Claims 2-6, which depend on Claim 1, should accordingly be withdrawn.

Furthermore, more specifically with respect to Claim 3, it is unclear how Long discloses generating at graphical user interface configuration data, workbench data and benchmark data. The Examiner refers to col. 24, lines 27-45, which describes an I/O emulator utility program, which does not relate to generating configuration data, workbench data or benchmark data.

Claim 5 specifies that said test types include defining a system configuration, test periods, and sequence of test repeats. Claim 5 is dependent on Claim 4, which specifies selecting, using the graphical user interface, from various test types for the input sequence of commands, in a point and click fashion. The Examiner cites col. 14, line 59 to col. 15, line 3, which discloses an I/O request profiler comparing read requests with particular patterns. This does not relate to selecting test types, much less test types defining a system configuration, test periods, and sequence of test repeats.

Claims 1-7 are pending in the present application. Each of the claims is believed to be in condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Rajesh Vallabh  
Reg. No. 35,761  
for Gary A. Walpert  
Reg. No. 26,098  
Attorney for Applicant

Hale and Dorr LLP  
60 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
(617) 526-6000  
July 22, 2003  
Attorney Docket No.: 100157.151